Arlington Conservation Commission

Date: Thursday, May 20, 2021
Time: 7:30 PM
Location: Conducted by Remote Participation

Please note: The listing of matters are those reasonably anticipated which may be discussed at the meeting. Not all items listed may in fact be discussed and other items not listed may be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.

Agenda

1. Administrative

    a. In accordance with the Governor's Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G. L. c. 30A, § 20 relating to the COVID-19 emergency, the May 20, 2021 public meeting of the Arlington Conservation Commission shall be physically closed to the public to avoid group congregation. The meeting shall instead be held virtually using Zoom.

    Topic: Conservation Commission Meeting
    Time: May 20, 2021 07:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

    Register in advance for this meeting:
    https://town-arlington-ma-us.zoom.us/meeting/register/tJIpdO6tqzwiGNaP-np4dIColqzt9SDPMxfW

    Members of the public are strongly encouraged to send written comment regarding any of the hearings listed below to Conservation Agent Emily Sullivan at esullivan@town.arlington.ma.us.

    Please read Governor Baker's Executive Order Suspending Certain Provision of Open Meeting Law for more information regarding virtual public hearings and meetings: https://www.mass.gov/doc/open-meeting-law-order-march-12- 2020/download

    b. Review draft 05/06/2021 minutes

    c. Discuss updates to the Thorndike Place comprehensive permit application.

    d. Discuss updates to the 1165R Mass Ave comprehensive permit application.

    e. Discuss possible CPA projects the Conservation Commission can pursue in the future.

Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Review draft 05/06/2021 minutes

Summary:
Review draft 05/06/2021 minutes

ATTACHMENTS:

	Type	File Name	Description
🗋	Minutes	05062021_Minutes_Conservation_Commission.pdf	Draft 05/06/2021 minutes

Arlington Conservation Commission

Date: May 06, 2021
Time: 7:30pm
Location: Conducted through Remote Participation using Zoom

Minutes
Attendance: Commission Members Susan Chapnick (Chair), Mike Gildesgame, Pam Heidell, Dave Kaplan, Nathaniel Stevens, Chuck Tirone (Vice Chair), and David White; Associate Commissioners Cathy Garnett and Doug Kilgour; and Conservation Agent Emily Sullivan. Members of the public included Mary O'Connor (1165R Mass Ave 40B), Al Gala (102-104 Milton St), Rich Kirby (102-104 Milton St, 55 Orient Ave, 11 Norton Rd), Pedro Costa, Albert Azatyants (102-104 Milton St), Stephan Bilharz (102-104 Milton St), Victor Larin, Michael Dimaggio, Liz Stanton (55 Orient Ave), and Jennifer Brown.

04/15/2021 Meeting Minutes
The Commission discussed edits to the draft 04/15/2021 minutes. N. Stevens motioned to approve the minutes as edited, D. White seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

Project Updates
E. Sullivan provided project updates on the Spy Pond dredging project, the Reservoir Master Plan Phase 2 project, and 47 Spy Pond Lane.

E. Sullivan stated that the Spy Pond dredging project is underway. The site has been prepared, the pre-construction meeting went well, and the dredger is in the water. MassDOT, the project owner, expects dredging to begin in the next few weeks. E. Sullivan stated that the Route 2 pathway will be closed as needed during the project for pedestrian safety. E. Sullivan also stated that Spy Pond aquatic invasive treatment will occur sometime in May.

E. Sullivan stated that the Arlington Reservoir Master Plan Phase 2 project is underway. The pre-construction meeting went well and the contractor will begin with tree trimming and removal work. The contractor will conduct the shoreline stabilization work and pathway restoration work during beach season. After beach season, the playground work and parking lot work will occur. The water level of the Reservoir had to be lowered in order to conduct the shoreline stabilization work. Due to the lower water level, which

may not be restored until the fall depending on rainfall, the Town may not be able to harvest the water chestnut with the mechanical harvester.

E. Sullivan stated that the Town Engineer had approved the plans for the off-site stormwater management unit proposed at the intersection of Princeton Road and Alfred Road as part of the 47 Spy Pond Lane permitting process. The stormwater unit will be installed in May.

S. Chapnick stated that MassDEP had provided guidance regarding ~~streams~~ in a recent email regarding determining if streams are intermittent or perennial and using the most current USGS map to make determinations~~.~~ P. Heidell noted that a stream's status as perennial or intermittent affects riverfront jurisdictional status. She noted that the Town's GIS mapping of Reed Brook's riverfront area is not correct and is ~~jurisdictional streams was~~ not consistent with MassDEP's email guidance and the WPA's Riverfront regulations (which the Town's regulations also reference). ~~.~~She stated that Reed's Brook is shown as intermittent on the latest USGS map and where the Brook's drainage area is more than 1/2 square mile, it does no~~'~~t have a predicted flow rate greater than or equal to .01 cos at the 99% flow duration using USGS stream stats. Therefore, it does no~~'~~t meet wetland regulations' definition for a stream to be considered a river subject to riverfront standards, and so showing a 200 foot riverfront area on town GIS making is not correct. The Commission agreed to discuss stream jurisdiction and how it is defined in the Arlington Regulations for Wetlands Protection, and change the GIS mapping accordingly.

Thorndike Place 40B Comprehensive Permit Update
D. White recused himself from the Thorndike Place 40B discussion.

S. Chapnick stated that there were no updates to give the Commission regarding this project, and that the status was the same as summarized at the Commission's 4/15/2021 meeting.

P. Heidell asked whether the Applicant had taken groundwater level samples yet. E. Sullivan stated that she would find out.

Request for Certificate of Compliance: 1297 Mass Ave
MassDEP File #091-0321
Documents Reviewed:

1) *1297 Mass Ave NOI*
2) *1297 Mass Ave OOC*
3) *1297 Mass Ave Request for Certificate of Compliance (RCOC) and As-Built*
4) *COC Internal Checklist*

Resource Areas:

- *100-ft Wetlands Buffer*
- *Adjacent Upland Resource Area (AURA)*
- *200-ft Riverfront Area*

- *Mill Brook*

The project as approved involved: (1) remediating contaminated soil from a kitchen grease oil spill by removing and replacing the contaminated soil; (2) removing one existing tree and replacing it with two native trees; (3) restoring the area with native plantings – 60 cinnamon ferns; and (4) installing two new traffic bollards behind the grease container to prevent future spills. The project site is located within the 200-ft Riverfront Area, 100-ft Wetlands Buffer, and Adjacent Upland Resource Area of Mill Brook. The project was approved on 6/9/2020.

The Commission reviewed the RCOC materials. E. Sullivan summarized her site visit to the property to inspect for compliance. E. Sullivan stated that the site was in compliance, and that she recommended issuing a full Certificate of Compliance with the following continuing conditions:

39. All plantings shall be native and be installed and maintained according to the standards of the American Association of Nurserymen (AAN). **This shall be a continuing condition that survives the expiration of the permit and shall be included in any Certificate of Compliance as a continuing condition.**

40. All plantings planted through this project shall be maintained for three years. A survival rate of at least 75% must be maintained for the approved plantings. **The Conservation Agent shall be contacted by the Property Owner to conduct annual inspections of the plantings sometime between September 15-November 1 2021, 2022, and 2023.**

41. To avoid adding excess nitrogen runoff to Mill Brook, the Applicant shall only treat the approved planted area with slow release nitrogen fertilizer. Application of this fertilizer cannot occur in the summer, or after storm events. Lawn fertilizer shall only be applied twice a year, in spring and fall. No herbicides shall be used to treat invasive or unwanted plants. New plantings shall only be fertilized once, during the initial planting year. No pesticides or rodenticides shall be used to treat pest management issues within the Wetland Buffers Zone or Riverfront Area. **This shall be a continuing condition that survives the expiration of the permit and shall be included in any Certificate of Compliance as a continuing condition in perpetuity.**

42. Pervious surfaces shown on the project plans shall be maintained and not be replaced by impervious surfaces. **This shall be a continuing condition that survives the expiration of the permit and shall be included in any Certificate of Compliance as a continuing condition.**

44. The Applicant shall implement a weekly inspection for the grease container with a standardized inspection report through which the Commission will be informed of any future grease spills. The inspection form shall be the same form submitted to the Commission in the Supplement Materials Packet dated May 12, 2020. Each completed inspection forms shall be kept and maintained in a secure location by the Applicant at the Project Site and be available for the Commission's review; each inspection form shall be kept for three years from the date of the inspection. This

shall be a continuing condition that survives the expiration of the permit and shall be included in any Certificate of Compliance as a continuing condition.

45. The Applicant shall maintain a spill kit onsite, conforming to the specifications submitted to the Commission in the Supplement Materials Packet dated May 12, 2020. This shall be a continuing condition that survives the expiration of the permit and shall be included in any Certificate of Compliance as a continuing condition.

N. Stevens motioned to issue a full Certificate of Compliance with continuing conditions # 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 45, C. Tirone seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

Notice of Intent: 102-104 Milton Street
MassDEP File #091-0328
Documents Reviewed:

1) *102-104 Milton Street NOI*
2) *102-104 Milton Street NOI Plans*

Resource Areas:

- *Floodplain*
- *Alewife Brook*

R. Kirby presented the project proposal to the Commission. This project proposes to construct an addition to a 2-family dwelling and conduct site work within the floodplain of Alewife Brook.

The Applicant proposes to remove the existing porch, two storage sheds, and associated concrete landing, walkways, and brick paver patio located off the rear of the dwelling, and construct a living space addition (with roof deck), with new steps and landing steps. The front porch will be reconstructed within the existing footprint. Two additional landings with steps are proposed on either side (east and west) of the dwelling to improve access/egress from the units. Two 11.5’ X 11.5’ permeable paver patios are also proposed in the backyard within an existing low point to promote stormwater management.

The existing paved driveway east of the dwelling will be reduced by roughly half, with the newly exposed land converted to a paver walkway, lawn, and landscaped land. A permeable paver apron will be added to the proposed driveway entrance off Milton Street, and the second paved driveway located west of the dwelling will be converted to permeable pavers. In total, the project results in a 1,048± square-foot reduction (or roughly 32% reduction) of impervious area, with existing impervious area measuring roughly 3,270 square feet, and proposed impervious area measuring roughly 2,222 square feet.

Two (2) flood vents will be installed in the foundation walls of the addition to allow for flood water to ebb and flow as needed during anticipated flooding associated with the

0.1% Annual Chance Flood. Compensatory flood storage is proposed, including 113 cubic feet between elevations 4 and 5 (6.2:1); 153 cubic feet between elevations 5 and 6 (4.25:1), and 187 cubic feet between elevations 6 and 7 (5.2:1). The planting of native saplings and shrubs is also proposed to improve existing site conditions.

S. Chapnick stated that she was pleased with the project proposal. S. Chapnick asked if an Operations & Maintenance Plan (O&M Plan) had been submitted for the porous paver driveways and patios. R. Kirby stated that an O&M Plan had not been submitted, but A. Gala, who was at the meeting, could provide the O&M information.

S. Chapnick asked whether the project was proposing to handle roof runoff differently than it is currently managed. R. Kirby stated that the project proposes to decrease impervious surface onsite by 32%. Other than that, no additional stormwater management is proposed.

S. Chapnick stated that the Town's Stormwater Management Bylaw has a threshold of 350 square feet for stormwater permitting and mitigation, but that the Commission has no minimum threshold for stormwater management.

P. Heidell requested that the Commission be sent the Certificate of No Rise and other building documents submitted to Inspectional Services for work in the FEMA floodplain.

P. Heidell asked if the groundwater levels were known onsite. R. Kirby stated that they had not conducted test pits for groundwater. D. Kaplan asked if test pits were not conducted, was there a potential that groundwater could fill the compensatory storage of the proposed storage areas. R. Kirby stated that test pits would be conducted to confirm that this could not happen. A. Gala stated that since the project proposed to reduce impervious surface onsite, there were no concerns about the water table. A. Gala agreed with R. Kirby, and stated they could conduct test pits to confirm no issues.

D. White asked if the existing basement has sump pumps. S. Bilharz stated that yes the basement has a sump pump. A. Azatyants stated that the basement is fully finished and there is no evidence of staining or water damage.

C. Garnett stated that this project reminded her of the hotel project on Alewife Brook, located at 1 Mass Ave. C. Garnett asked for clarification on underground compensatory flood storage tanks. R. Kirby clarified that there were no subsurface storage tanks as part of this project. Floodwaters will be able to ebb and flow from under the porch. R. Kirby stated that this method of compensatory flood storage had been used for projects permitted on Lafayette Street and Fairmont Street. C. Garnett asked whether those permitted projects had experienced a 1% annual rain event yet. R. Kirby stated that a 1% annual rain event had not occurred since the projects have been constructed.

C. Tirone asked whether the patio areas were part of this site's calculations. R. Kirby stated that the patios were not included in compensatory flood storage calculations and this project did not have stormwater calculations.

C. Tirone asked if there was a detail for the porous pavers. R. Kirby stated that the porous paver detail was on the sheet C-1 of the plan set, and that there was a detail for the patios and a detail for the driveways. The pavers would be installed above 15 inches of crushed stone. C. Tirone stated that he would like to see an O&M Plan for the porous pavers, particularly for the driveways since there is potential for clogging.

C. Tirone asked how the flood vents were sized and located. A. Gala stated that the vents have a 200 square foot capacity each, and are located based on site elevation and which elevations are most critical for compensatory flood storage.

C. Tirone asked for more information on the addition's foundation. A. Gala stated that the current foundation is a smooth concrete foundation, and the proposed foundation would be a frost wall, and would not be open to the existing foundation.

P. Heidell asked if there was an opportunity for more freeboard between the bottom of the first floor and basement. A. Gala stated that there is 5 feet of freeboard proposed, which is sufficient.

P. Heidell asked if the compensatory flood storage calculations included the new porch steps. A. Gala stated the steps were not included in the compensatory flood storage calculations. P. Heidell stated that the steps should be included in the calculations.

C. Tirone asked about the ownership of the units. S. Bilharz stated that it is currently one owner, but the dwellings will be converted into condos. R. Kirby stated that a condition of the permit could be to record the Orders of Condition (OOC) against both deeds. C. Garnett stated that both condo owners should be responsible for the O&M of the project. C. Tirone recommended that the OOC could include a condition that the condo owners needed to send proof of receipt and understand of the OOC to the Commission. E. Sullivan stated that a similar condition was added to the 47 and 49 Spy Pond Lane permits. M. Gildesgame recommended including both C. Tirone's and R. Kirby's recommended conditions in the OOC.

The Commission opened the hearing to public comment.

J. Adams asked how many condos were proposed for this property. S. Bilharz stated two condos were proposed. J. Adams noted that the western driveway was a shared driveway, and asked whether the Applicant would reach out to the property owner who shares the driveway. S. Bilharz confirmed that he will reach out to the property owner.

M. Dimaggio stated that he was an abutter and had not experienced any standing water or water issues on his property. M. Dimaggio noted that there is runoff from neighbors in this block, and stated that the porous pavers will be beneficial.

N. Stevens motioned to close the hearing, P. Heidell seconded, and the Commission began discussing any needed additional information for the project, including: 1) O&M

Plan for porous pavers, 2) test pits for groundwater level, and 3) adding the stairs and landings into the compensatory flood storage calculations.

N. Stevens withdrew his motion to close the hearing because he believed the additional requests were substantive.

R. Kirby stated that the project is providing a 6:1 compensatory flood storage, and the addition of stairs and landings in the calculations is negligible and will certainly not reduce storage below the 2:1 requirement. P. Heidell stated she was trying to keep compensatory flood storage calculations consistent across Applicants since the Commission has required that stairs and landings be included in calculations for previous applications.

S. Chapnick stated that she agreed that consistency is important, but the 6:1 storage proposed is significantly beyond the 2:1 requirement. N. Stevens recommended that the Commission make a finding in the OOC that states that although the stairs and landings were not included in the compensatory flood storage calculations, including them would not make a substantive change in the compensatory flood storage calculation.

A. Gala provided more information about the O&M requirements for the porous pavers. The pavers should be vacuumed every two (2) years or whenever ponding is observed. Sand and salt should also not be used to treat the pavers. The Commission agreed that rather than wait for an O&M Plan from the Applicant, the Commission would include a condition outlining the O&M that A. Gala described, and require the property owner to manage the pavers accordingly.

C. Tirone asked if the porous pavers were selected for decorative purposes, or whether they are required. R. Kirby stated that porous pavers are not required, but the Applicant wanted to make the project climate resilient.

N. Stevens motioned to close the hearing, M. Gildesgame seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

The Commission discussed permit conditions, including:

1) The Commission's standard landscape monitoring and survival
2) The Commission must be sent the Certificate of No Rise and other relevant building documents
3) O&M for the porous pavers shall include vacuuming every two (2) years or whenever pooling is observed, and use of sand and salt are prohibited
4) The new condo property owners must send confirmation to the Commission that they have received the OOC and understand the conditions.

C. Tirone motioned to approve the project and issue an Order of Conditions under the State Wetlands Protection Act and Arlington Bylaw for Wetlands Protection with the

discussed conditions, M. Gildesgame seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

Notice of Intent: 55 Orient Ave
MassDEP File #091-0329
Documents Reviewed:

1) *55 Orient Ave NOI*
2) *55 Orient Ave NOI Plans*

Resource Areas:

- *Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW*
- *100-ft Wetlands Buffer*
- *Adjacent Upland Resource Area (AURA)*

R. Kirby presented the project proposal to the Commission. This project proposes to construct an addition to a single-family dwelling and conduct site work within the 100-ft Wetlands Buffer and AURA of a bordering vegetated wetland.

The project proposes to demolish the sunroom and concrete deck stairs located off the rear of the dwelling and construct a two-story addition in its place. The proposed addition will be constructed atop a frost-wall foundation and measure 17 feet in width (the same as the existing sunroom) and extend 14 feet from the existing house foundation, which is roughly 6 feet beyond the sunroom footprint. This expansion is largely located within existing lawn and the concrete steps to be removed, and measures roughly 95 feet from the BVW boundary at its closest point, and roughly 31 feet from the drainage ditch pipe outlet. The project results in a roughly 100 square-foot increase in impervious area. New wooden steps are proposed to provide access from the deck to the backyard. The proposed deck stairs measure roughly 95 feet from the BVW boundary at its closest point and roughly 23 feet from the drainage ditch pipe outlet.

S. Chapnick asked whether this project proposes any invasive management work, particularly so the proposed native plantings are not overtaken by existing invasive plants. R. Kirby stated that the existing invasives are primarily bittersweet and Norway maples, and that this project does not include invasive species management. R. Kirby stated that the property owner could work with the Conservation Agent to determine which invasives should be managed and how the invasives can be managed. The Commission agreed that working with the Conservation Agent on invasive management could be added as a permit condition.

C. Garnett stated that an industry standard for landscape architecture is to overplant planting plans by 20% to ensure adequate survival.

D. Kaplan observed that there is significant erosion along the drainage ditch, and asked whether there was a natural, cost-effective stabilization strategy to address the erosion. R. Kirby stated that an engineer would need to design a solution for the erosion.

C. Tirone stated that the drainage ditch could have gotten more restoration attention. The drainage ditch could be enhanced to slow down water flow and filter out stormwater pollutants. C. Tirone stated that small pools could have been added to the drainage ditch as a restoration technique. C. Tirone asked whether the drainage ditch is jurisdiction under the local Wetlands Protection Bylaw. R. Kirby stated that the drainage ditch was not jurisdictional under the Wetlands Protection Actor and was not jurisdictional under the Wetlands Protection Bylaw. It is not jurisdictional under the Bylaw because there is no upstream wetlands source.
The Commission opened the hearing to public comment.

J. Brown stated that she was an abutter and that she was confident that the property owner would abide by the planting requirements proposed in this project. J. Brown asked for clarification on construction access, and whether it would be from Summer Street or Orient Ave. R. Kirby clarified that construction access off of Summer Street is not possible because of an extensive wetlands system, so access will be from Orient Ave.

J. Brown asked how many storied the addition will be. R. Kirby stated the proposed addition is two (2) stories.

D. Kaplan motioned to close the hearing, C. Tirone seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

The Commission discussed permit conditions, including:

1) The Commission’s standard landscape monitoring and survival

N. Stevens asked whether the Commission was comfortable with designating the drainage ditch as a drainage ditch in this project, and how this may relate to Ryder Brook and the 1165R Mass Ave 40B comprehensive permit proposal.

C. Tirone stated that he considered the Orient Ave drainage ditch and Ryder Brook the same.

S. Chapnick stated that she did not consider the Orient Ave drainage ditch and Ryder Brook the same. S. Chapnick was comfortable with the Orient Ave drainage ditch not being jurisdictional under the Wetlands Protection Act and local Bylaw, but did not think the same for Ryder Brook.

N. Stevens agreed with S. Chapnick. N. Stevens stated that he would consider the Orient Ave drainage ditch to become jurisdictional where the pipe ends and opens into a natural system.

P. Heidell stated that Ryder Brook has more history and seems more established as a brook, which is not the case for the Orient Ave drainage ditch. P. Heidell also stated that the Orient Ave drainage ditch has less resource area value than Ryder Brook. P. Heidell stated that the Orient Ave drainage ditch is not jurisdictional under the Wetlands Protection Act and local Bylaw.

C. Tirone stated that the Orient Ave drainage ditch and Ryder Brook are similar, but Ryder Brook has been professionally managed which the Orient Ave drainage ditch has not.

D. White stated that there is always standing water at the top of Ryder Brook next to the bikeway, which is not true for the Orient Ave drainage ditch.

D. Kaplan stated that Ryder Brook seems to have seasonal conditions, and that as the water table rises Ryder Brook holds water. The Orient Ave drainage ditch is clearly road runoff conveyance and lacks the seasonal conditions that Ryder Brook experiences.

C. Tirone stated that standing water is not a condition of determining whether a drainage ditch is jurisdictional. C. Tirone stated that the three (3) criteria for determining jurisdiction include plant species, soil characteristics, and hydrologic connection. S. Chapnick stated those criteria are for the Wetlands Protection Act, not the local Bylaw.

R. Kirby stated that the Bylaw includes the phrase “due to hydraulic gradient” which suggests a water table is present, like D. Kaplan observed. The Orient Ave drainage ditch does not have a water table connection to support flow, and therefore it is not jurisdictional under the Bylaw.

C. Tirone motioned to approve the project and issue an Order of Conditions under the State Wetlands Protection Act and Arlington Bylaw for Wetlands Protection with the discussed conditions, M. Gildesgame seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

N. Stevens ~~stated~~ suggested that the 55 Orient Ave permit should include a finding that explains how the 55 Orient Ave drainage ditch is not jurisdictional under the Bylaw due to not having a hydraulic gradient present.

Request for Amendment to Approved Restoration Plan: 11 Norton Road, Lexington
MassDEP File #201-1190

R. Kirby summarized the request for amendment to an approved restoration plan. The project proposed to raze and rebuild a single-family dwelling abutting Arlington's Great Meadows (AGM). The project also included additional habitat restoration and native plantings on AGM property. As part of the permitting process, the Applicant consulted with the Arlington Conservation Commission at its 08/06/2020 meeting to determine the scope of the mitigation plantings on AGM property. The Applicant is requesting a minor modification to the habitat restoration to move three boulders deeper into the AGM property. Although not permitted by the Arlington Conservation Commission, the project was permitted by the Lexington Conservation Commission.

The Commission stated that without additional snow storage space by pushing back the three boulders, there would be a safety issue onsite. C. Tirone recommended that removable bollards could be installed rather than boulders, so that during non-winter times the full restoration area could be protected.

S. ~~Chpanick~~ Chapnick stated that the Commission has a policy against snow storage in conservation areas. In the past, the Commission has issued enforcements for illegal snow storage/dumping. N. Stevens noted that these enforcements had been for illegal storage in bordering vegetated wetlands and waterbodies, and that he was comfortable with allowing for some snow storage in Riverfront Area. N. Steven and S. Chapnick notes that they appreciate all of the restoration the project is doing on Arlington land, and stated that the restoration outweighed the snow storage.

D. White stated that the Applicant should add more restoration to compensate for the snow storage area. N. Stevens stated that additional restoration should not be mandatory. R. Kirby stated that the Applicant could add an additional 10 shrubs outside of the restoration area, placed at the discretion of a wetlands scientist.

The Commission vote to approve the amendment request. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

Discussion: 1165R Mass Ave 40B Comprehensive Permit Update- Relocating Ryder Brook

The Commission discussed the proposal to relocate Ryder Brook.

C. Tirone stated that it would be unfair to expand the jurisdictional reach of Ryder Brook onto abutting properties if Ryder Brook is relocated. C. Tirone stated that if Ryder Brook is jurisdictional, the Commission should not allow it to be relocated. C. Tirone stated that Ryder Brook does not meet the three (3) criteria to make it jurisdictional. These criteria include plant species, soil characteristics, and hydrologic connection.

E. Sullivan presented her analysis of the change in Resource Areas on adjacent properties and found that 15 Ryder would have an increase of 6.83% and 33 Ryder

would have an increase of 6.19% of 100-ft Wetlands Buffer and Adjacent Upland Resource Area.

D. White suggested that the Commission could recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) issue a waiver to relocate Ryder Brook.

P. Heidell stated that the abutting properties of 15 Ryder St and 33 Ryder St have resource area jurisdiction that is primarily 200-ft Riverfront Area. The Commission cannot consider the implications of having 200-ft Riverfront Area jurisdiction the same as having 100-ft Wetlands Buffer or AURA jurisdiction since the performance standards are different. P. Heidell stated that 15 Ryder St and 33 Ryder St are industrial zoned parcels, which Arlington does not have many of. P. Heidell stated that the Commission should consult with the Department of Planning and Community Development, ZBA, and Redevelopment Board if relocating Ryder Brook will impact the jurisdictional status of these abutting parcels and create new 100-ft Wetlands Buffer and AURA jurisdictions.

M. Gildesgame noted that in a 2016 permit application, the Commission determined that Ryder Brook was jurisdictional under the Bylaw. M. Gildesgame asked whether the conditions of Ryder Brook have changed that would result in a different determination.

N. Stevens stated that Ryder Brook was jurisdictional under the Bylaw, though acknowledged that it did not have significant value. N. Stevens stated that its only value was drainage. N. Stevens stated that the ZBA can grant a waiver to move it. N. Stevens was not sure if the ZBA could determine if the relocated Ryder Brook would be jurisdictional.

C. Tirone stated that he disagreed with the jurisdiction of Ryder Brook and stated that it was just a drainage ditch for stormwater conveyance.

D. Kaplan stated that he would want to consult with a wetlands scientist to better understand how the three (3) criteria C. Tirone was referencing interacted with an intermittent stream designation.

N. Stevens stated that the Wetlands Protect Act defines stream differently than the local Bylaw.

S. Chapnick asked for a roll call vote from the Commission on whether each Commissioner thinks it is acceptable for the ZBA to issue a waiver to allow for the relocation of Ryder Brook. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

N. Stevens motioned to close the Commission meeting, M. Gildesgame seconded, all were in favor, motioned approved.

Meeting adjourned at 10:40pm.

CPA Projects Discussion

Summary:
Discuss possible CPA projects the Conservation Commission can pursue in the future.

ATTACHMENTS:

	Type	File Name	Description
	Reference Material	P_Heidell_CPA_Memo_Aquatic_Management.pdf	P Heidell Memo_Aquatic CPA Project Opportunities
	Reference Material	P_Heidell_CPA_Memo_Land_Management.pdf	P Heidell Memo_Land CPA Project Opportunities

MEMO

TO: Conservation Commission
FROM: Pam Heidell
SUBJECT: Water Management Studies/Aquatic Invasive Species Projects Funded under the Community Preservation Act
DATE: February 13, 2020

The Community Preservation Act funds projects in four asset categories: Open Space[1] is one of these, and allowable projects include, but are not limited to, the acquisition, creation and **preservation of open space.** Below please see a list of projects in 50 communities that have used CPA funds for Pond and Lake Management Plans, water quality investigations, water quality improvements, and aquatic vegetation management.[2] The list is intended to be instructive as we consider how a Mystic Lakes Management Plan may be funded and developed, as well as aquatic invasive species management.

Abington

Island Grove Pond Study. Study to determine the type of invasive plant species growing in the island Grove Pond, and to determine the method and cost of removing the plants. (2019)

Acton

Ice House Pond and Robbins Mill Pond - Water Chestnut Removal. Funding has been made to fund a three-year water chestnut removal program. The preservation project will be conducted by a licensed environmental company using mechanical harvesting. (2015)

Ashland

Lake Waushakum Pollution Prevention and Algae Control Implentation. Study to install a hydrodynamic separator at outfall, to reduce pollutants entering the lake, and apply alum treatment for weed and algae control. (2008)

CPA definition: "Open Space," shall include, but not be limited to, land to protect existing and future well fields, aquifers and recharge areas, watershed land, agricultural land, grasslands, fields, forest land, fresh and salt water marshes and other wetlands, ocean, river, stream, lake and pond frontage, beaches, dunes and other coastal lands, lands to protect scenic vista, lands for wildlife or nature preserve and land for recreational use.

[2]The list is derived from the Community Preservation Coalition database of projects. In addition to the projects listed here, many communities have used CPA funds for management of invasive on conservation lands. Typically, projects were funded under the Open Space category, but some were also funded under Recreation11. The Coalition database contains a note that the data base in self-reported by CPA communities and that allowable use determinations are made locally and the Preservation Coalition does not monitor or verify project information for accuracy or compliance with CPA.

Lake Waushakum Pollution Prevention Design and Grant Application. Hire a consultant to provide preliminary designs and apply for S.319 grants to implement pollution prevention and algae control solutions recommended by DEP . (2008)

Study of Lake Waushakum. Environmental and engineering study of Lake Waushakum (2006).

Ayer

Invasive Vegetation control/study. CPA funds for a comprehensive survey and biological assessments of Ayer Ponds (Sandy, Long, Flanagan, Grove, Pine Meadow and Balch) with recommendations for long term management. (2014)

Invasive Vegetation control/study. To fund treatment and a study of dams and ponds. (2011)

Becket

Center Lake Weed Control Project. Funding for removal of invasive weeds. (2010)

Bedford:

Fawn Lake Permitting and Design. For permitting/design work for Fawn Lake to address aquatic vegetation and possible dam replacement. (2016)

Fawn Lake. Additional funding for preservation of Fawn Lake, clearing weeds, etc. to keep habitat healthy. (2004)

Fawn Lake: For many years, Fawn Lake has been filling with decaying plant matter. To address this, funding for a program of hydro raking, spot herbicide application and other steps. (2003)

Belchertown

Presevation and rehabilitation of the Tri-Lakes by establishing and funding a water quality program. (2017)

Tri-Lakes Watershed Protection. Water Quality Baseline Analysis on Lakes Arcadia, Holland and Metacomet. (2008)

Chelmsford

Freeman Lake Vegetation Project. Survey to improve quality of lake. (2017)

Invasive Weed Removal at Heart Pond. Removal and treatment of invasive weeds, including Fanwort and Curly Leafed Pondweed at Heart Pond. (2011)

Concord

Warners Pond Watershed Management Plan. Completion of Watershed Management Plan for Warners Pond which would assist Town in preserving the area and provide guidance for future projects. (2010)

Warners Pond Dredging Project (2019)

Dracut

Long Pond Aquatic Weed Control. Stabilize weed control program to preserve portion of Long Pond. (2013)

Dunstable

Lake Massapoag. Preservation of Lake Massapaog through removal of invasive weed species . (2018)33

Eastham

Herring Pond Treatment. Treatment of Herring Pond for reducing the effects of phosphorous. (2012)

Preserve Minister/School House Ponds. The grant requested by the Water Management Committee would be to restore water quality in the ponds. (2019)

Easthampton

Nashawannuck Pond Dredging. To dredge Pond and clear of weeds and invasive species. (2005)

Nashawannuck Pond dredging. Additional funds for dredging and preservation of Nashawannuck pond restoring habitat and water quality. (2007)

Falmouth

Oyster Pond Invasive plant species removal. CPA funds will contribute to the costs associated with halting and reversing the spread of phragmites to preserve habitat for native species. (2009)

Oyster Pond Invasive Plant Removal Project - Phase 2. To continue the removal of phragmites from Oyster Pond and the water body south of it. (2012)

Upper Childs River and Farley Bog Reservation. Many facets to the project, including the removal of invasive plant species. (2018)

Georgetown

Pentucket and Rock Ponds Invasives Prevention. Funds from appropriation of 5,000 unspent after a period of threes years from the date of approval of this article will be returned to the Community Preservation fund..(2010)

Pentucket Pond fanwort treatment. (2010)

Grafton

Silver Lake Weed Barrier. To further fund the installation of a benthic weed barrier at Silver Lake Beach to preserve the beach. (2007)

Lake Ripple dredging. To improve the overall habitat of Lake Ripple by dredging and removing weeds from an overgrown area. (2005)

Silver Lake Weed Barrier. To purchase and install aquatic weed control materials at Silver Lake Beach to preserve the beach. (2004)

Groton

2018-02. Baddacook Pond. This project continues a 3-year plan to restore Baddacook Pond by weed harvesting and hydro-raking of invasive weeds. (2018)

2018-02. Baddacook Pond. This project funds the mechanical removal of invasive seeds from Baddacook Pond to improve the health of the Ponds. (2017)

Groveland

Johnson's Pond Management Plan. Management Plan taking water quality measurements and improving access by removing invasive species and undesirable weeds to improve passive recreation use, fishing and boating on Johnson's Pond. (2017)

Hadley

Monitoring of water quality in Lake Warner. (2016)

Lake Warner water testing. (2019)

Hamilton

Weaver Pond Nuisance Vegetation Control. Includes the use and operation of the hydro-rake to remove plants with large/well-developed root systems, (2009).

Weaver Pond Restoration. The removal of invasive species in Weaver Pond. (2018)

Harvard

Bare Hill Pond Drawdown Pump Project. For the purchase and installation of a drawdown pumping station for Bare Hill Pond to preserve pond from invasive weeds. (2006)

Hingham

Cushing Pond restoration. To treat the Pond with federal and state approved chemicals to remove invasive plant species. Initial application plus 3 booster applications (2006)

Holliston

Lake Winthrop Management Plan. Develop a Management Plan to preserve, restore and improve environmental benefits. Plan will identify strategies to manage invasive. (2012)

Mashpee

Restoration of the Upper Quashnet River System. To restore river system to improve water quality, aquatic and riverbank habitat, and to re-establish once prolific cold water fishery. (2019)

Mendon

Invasive Non-Native Water Chestnut Removal. Removal of 60 tons of the invasive non-native water chestnut from the Inman Pond located on Meadow Brook Woods 1 property. (2009)

Invasive Non-Native Water Chestnut Removal. Removing invasive non-native water chestnuts form the Inman Pond on the meadow Brook Woods Property. (2010)

Invasive Non-Native Water Chestnut Removal. Removing invasive non-native water chestnuts form the Inman Pond. (2012)

Invasive Non-Native Water Chestnut Removal. To remove invasive weed mechanically and by hand to preserve the health of the pond. (2013)

Mechanical Weed Removal on Inman Pond. Mechanical removal of the non-native invasive water chestnut weed from the Inman Pond. (2014)

Nantucket

Nantucket Land Council Hummock Pond. Restoration of water quality in Head of Hummock Pond for years 1 and 2. The control of Eutrophication and Harmful algal blooms using habitat disturbance and long-distance circulation with solar-bee technology. (2011)

The Nantucket Pond Coalition. To eradicate Phragmites on White Goose Cove, Long Pond subject to approval of the Nantucket Conservation Commission. (2016)

Needham

Rosemary Lake Sediment Removal. Design funds to determine scope of work to remove sediment from Rosemary Lake, improving quality of water flowing into Rosemary Brook (2016)

Rosemary Lake Sediment Removal. Dredging and off-site management of sediment. (2018)

Norwell

Jacobs Pond Restoratio**n.** Weed control of pond. (2014)

Norfolk

Environmental Assessment Town Ponds. Conduct an environmental assessment and survey of the southern portion of Bush Pond, Highland Lake and Town Pond. (2011)

Northampton

Broad Brook Coalition Invasive Removal. Removal of invasive species at Fitzgerald Lake Conservation Area. (2019).

19D Fitzgerald Lake Invasive Control- Broad Brook Coalition. Funding for continued removal of invasive plants within the Fitzgerald Lake Conservation Area . (2016)

85- Invasive Removal - Lathrop Communities. Priority invasive species removal at Parsons Brook and Broad Brook.(2015)

Northborough

Weed Control at Bartlett Pond. Approximately every three years, Bartlett Pond is evaluated and treated for weeds. Systemic herbicide to reduce infestation of invasive weeds. (2017)

Weed Control at Bartlett Pond. Perform weed control measures on problem vegetation within Bartlett Pond. (2013)

Oak Bluffs

Mass Estuaries Project - Oak Bluffs Harbor and Sunset Lake. Preparation of water quality reports through the Massachusetts Estuaries Program for two significant watersheds. (2011)

Farm Pond Invasive Species Mapping. Maps for monitoring primarily Phragamites, and invasive plan in hopes of restoring native oyster population and bringing people back to the pond. (2007)

Pembroke

Pond Treatment. Treatment of Oldham Pond for suppression of blue-green algae and for the treatment of Hobomock Pond for hydrilla control. (2017)

Pond Treatment. Treatment of Oldham Pond for the suppression of blue-green algae; treatment of Hobomock Pond for hydrilla, and treatment of surface pond for microscopic algae.(2014)

Quincy

Butlers Pond Restoration. Study to improve the water quality of Butlers Pond. (2010)

DPW Sailor's Pond Feasibility Study. Sailors Pond Feasibility Study regarding invasive phragmites and water health. (2016)

Manet Lake Feasibility Study. Study and preserve integrity of Manet Lake (2017)

Randolph

Powers Farm Hydro-raking. Hydro-raking the pond will restore the depth through the removal of plant material and organic matter, increase available open water habitat for aquatic wildlife. (2016)

Glovers Brook Rehabilitation. Glovers Brook currently has a large build-up of silt and sand and invasive, non-native species. Removal of invasive plant life and silt and sand built up. (2017)

Belcher Park Pond Restoration: Over fertilization and excessive nutrient loading over the years have caused Belcher Pond to be full of recurrent algal blooms, reduced transparency and dense aquatic vegetation. The restoration will remove the aquatic vegetation improving the water quality and wildlife habitat restoration. (2017)

Norroway Pond Restoration. The remediation of Norrroway Pond will continue hydro-raking, remove invasive vegetation from the Parks's Atlantic White Cedar Swamp, as well as evaluation and implementation of treatment and aeration of the water. (2017)

Rockport

Millbrook Pond Dreding. Dreding and rehabilitating the historic Millbrook Pond and Frog Pond. (2016)

Millbrook Dredging 2. Completion of dredging project for Mill Pond and Frog Pond. (2012)

Stockbridge

Larrywaug Brook. Restoration and invasive species removal along Larrywaug Brook. (2014)

Lake Mahkeenac Management. To fund management of Lake Mahkeenac, to control invasive species, particularly the Eurasian Milfoil. (2009)

Kampoosa Bog Invasive Species Management. Removal and management of invasive species in Bog basin. (2009)

Stow

Lake Boon Preservation. For invasive aquatic vegetation removal preserve Lake Boon as a community resource. (2007)

Sudbury

Carding Mill Pond Harvesting. Harvest of non-native aquatic weeds. (2011)

Grist Mill, Carding Mill Pond and Stearns Mill Pond Invasive Weed Removal. Harvest invasive weeds from three ponds. (2015)

Grist Mill Pond, Carding Mill Pond and Stearns Mill Pond Invasive Weed Removal. Harvesting of non-native, invasive aquatic weeds and other restoration activities by the Hop Brook Protection Association one course of three year period. (2018)

Carding Mill Pond Harvesting. To harvest non-native aquatic weeds. (2006)

Tewksbury

Long Pond Water Quality. Chemically treat pond to address algae, nutrient levels, and aquatic plant management. FY17 Project.(2016)

Long Pond Water Quality. Additional treatment of Long Pond. (2017)

Long Pond Water Quality. Additional chemical treatment of impaired water body and shoreline cleaning. (2017)

Tisbury

Tashmoo Preserve-Herring Run Shellfish restoration. For restoration of Lake Tashmoo Herring Run including testing water and data collection .(2011)

Tashmoo Spring Pond Dredging 2015. Hire an engineer to help accomplish goals of dredging. Pond should see increased water clarity, become deeper and reduce algal growth. (2015)

Tyngsborough

Lake Mascuppic Invasive Species Removal. For invasive species removal. (2005)

Lake Mascuppic Invasive Species Removal Additional appropriation for invasive species removal. (2006)

Massapoag Pond. Weed control to preserve Lake Massapoag by allocating funds for non-invasive weed control. (2007)

Lake Mascuppic Weed Control Program. Execute a weed control program. (2018)

Lake Massapoag Weed Control Program. Execute a weed control program.(2018)

Upton

Lake Wildwood Restoration. Restoration and rehabilitation of land for recreational purposes specifically the treatment of Lake Wildwood for the eradication of invasive weeds. (2015)

Wayland

Great Ponds Management. For aerial scanning and nutrient analysis at the Great Ponds, tao to implement weed management techniques (2006)

Wellesley

Morses Pond. Implement a management study of Morses Pond under the joint direction of the Natural Resources Commission, the Recreation Commission and the DPW. (2004)

Morses Pond Management Weed Harvester. For anticipated capital expenditures for the first year of the proposed Morses Pond Management Plan, to be earmarked specifically for the aquisition of a weed harvester and accessory equipment. (2006)

Morses Pond Preservation. Construction and installation of a Phosphorous/sedimentaion inactivation system for Morses Poind as a component of the muitl-year Morses Pond Management Plan.(2007)

Morses Point Preservation. Supplemental appropriation for previously approved project for Phosphorous Deactivation System for Stormwater Treatment. (2008)

Morses Pond Preservation. Completion of the final phase of the restoration and preservation of Morse Pond with the dredging of North Basin. (2012)

Comprehensive Pond Management Plan. Funding for the Natural Resources Commission to assess and prioritize immediate concerns at the Town's ponds, and develop a long term preservation and maintenance plan. (2015)

Natural Resources Commission - Mobile Phosphorouss Inactivation Unit. Equipment will deliver aluminum poly chloride to the smaller ponds in Wellesley to limit the phosphorous which allows unwanted plant growth in the ponds

Westford

Nabnasset Lake Invasives Control. Control and treatment of invasive and nuisance aquatic vegetation. (2012)

Weston

Charles River Invasive Species Removal Project: Preserve open space by removing invasive Eurasian Water Chestnut from Kingsbury Cove in Weston and other areas in Lake District of Charles River. (2013)

Westport

Bread and Cheese Brook Estuaries Project Sampling. Sampling water of Bread and Cheese Brook as part of the nitrogen eliminating project of the Westport River. (2013).

Preparation of a Targeted Integrated Water Resource Management Plan for the East Branch of the Westport River . (2018).

Weymouth.

Weed Harvesting Whitman's Pond. Harvesting of weeds for Whitmans Pond. (2008)

Whitmans Pond Herbicide Treatment. Herbicide treatment for the west cove and main body of water for purpose of clearing out weeds at the boat launch ramp. (2009)

Whitman's Pond Herbicide Treatment. Herbicide treatment for recreational purpose of Whitman's Pond.. (2009)

Whitman's Pond Restoration. Vegetation Management Action Plan for Whitman's Pond. (2011)

Whitman's Pond Drawdown. Permit approvals to draw down lake level during the winter to eradicate invasive plant species. (2013)

Wilbraham.

Spec Pond Aquatic Vegetation Management. Removal of invasive species at Spec Pond to preserve and expand use of the pond .(2009)

Spec Pond Invasive Plant Remediation. Apply a treatment that will eliminate the weeds without killing the endangered plant terete arrowhead. The remedy is to install a benthic barrier on the bottom of pond to prevent weed proliferation. (2017)

MEMO

TO: Conservation Commission
FROM: Pam Heidell
SUBJECT: Community Preservation Act (CPA)

This memo addresses two questions raised at prior meetings: 1) can CPA funds be used to develop plans for conservation land management, and 2) does CPA have any limitations on funding multi-jurisdictional projects

Use of CPA funds for Developing Plans for Conservation Land

Under the asset category of Open Space, the state CPA data base shows that some communities have used CPA funds to develop management plans for conservation lands, e.g, under the CPA allowable category preservation of open space. Below are some examples:

Boxford. Conservation Commission projects to preserve, rehabilitate and restore conservation land and associated recreational resources: project is to fund various ConCom projects to preserve, rehabilitate and restore conservation land and associated recreational resources.

Chatham. Conservation Management Plan consultant: CPA funds to hire a consultant to develop a management plan for town conservation land.

Eastham. Open Space Monitoring: grant for the Eastham Conservation Foundation for the purpose of undertaking stewardship and preservation of 13 town-and conservation properties, and to make them more functional for their intended uses.

Easthampton Open Space: Analysis of parcels held for conservation purposes under the custody of the Conservation Commission

Harwich Comprehensive Lands Stewardship and Land Management Plan: project is to improve oversight of HarwichConservation Commission managed lands totaling approximately 720 acres.

Hopkinton Stewardship Plan: create a Stewardship Plant for town open space.

Needham Conservation Fund: transfer of funds to Needham Conservation Commission to allow ConCom to react promptly to open space and land management concerns.

Northhampton Ecological assessment of Open Space and Conservation lands: develop a plan that will allow for effective management of open space/priority habitats and biodiversity.

Westford Create Stewardship and Land Management Plan for conservation land.

There are also countless examples of communities using CPA funds to either develop Open Space plans, purchase lands or CRs, to use of CPA funds for control of invasives, or to develop trails and signage for individual properties.

CPA Funding for Multi-Jurisdiction Projects

An article *Regional Projects Are a Growing Area of Success for CPA Projects f*rom the state CPA Coalition says it all:

> *Historic preservation, open space protection, recreation, and affordable housing needs sometimes extend across CPA town boundaries. For example, sometimes a large, important open space parcel spans the borders of two or three neighboring communities. Or a regional school that serves two different CPA communities, but is physically located in just one of those communities, needs to rehabilitate its recreational playing fields. Increasingly, CPA communities are receiving funding requests for such regional CPA projects, and many are enthusiastically responding with grants of CPA funds. They are finding that if each communitrcey contributes some of their CPA funds towards the project, the same can be greater than the parts, and all of the communities benefit.*
>
> *The CPA statute (MGL Chapter 44B) specifies, in Section 6, that CPA funds can be expended in any city or town, presumably, of the Commonwealth. When the Legislature amended the CPA statute in the summer o 2012, one phrase was added to Section 5 (b) (1) specifically to encourage CPA communities to study and contemplate funding regional projects, as indicated in the following excerpt: "The Community Preservation Committee shall study the needs, possibilities, and resources of the city or town regarding community preservation,* ***including the consideration of regional projects for community protection.***

Also, examples from other communities include:

Essex CPA contribution of 50,000 toward Essex County Greenbelt purchase of a property to be combined with lands in Hamilton for a 525 acre property.

Fairhaven Buzzards Bay Coalition Mattapoiset Valley watershed Drinking Water Protection and trails project

Weymouth Feasibility Analysis of SmeltBrook: CPA matching funds for ACOE to conduct feasibility analysis of Smelt Brook above Weymouth landing. Project included matching funds from Braintree and Weymouth and funds from ACOE/

Southhampton: Project with Easthampton and Southampton to preserve lands over aquifer. Project sought funding from both towns' CPA committees, as well as state grants.